

Application No. 09/682,488

### REMARKS

The Office Action of May 27, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Of these, claims 1, 25, and 26 are independent claims. An Amendment faxed March 17, 2005 amended claims 1, 25, and 26.

This Amendment amends claims 1, 25, and 26 to more clearly set forth what is believed to be Applicant's claimed invention. Support for the amendments is found in Applicants specification in paragraph numbers 0115 through 0140, with particular reference to paragraph numbers 0120 through 0122. Also, this Amendment amends the specification to recite a recently issued patent number. Accordingly, no new matter is believed to be introduced by these amendments.

#### 1. Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103

The Office Action, on pages 2-14, rejects claims 1-15 and 17-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view Lamming et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,862,321 (hereinafter referred to as Lamming) and further in view of Fogarty, U.S. Patent No. 6,311,180 (hereinafter referred to as Fogarty). In response thereto, Applicant amends claims 1, 25, and 26 to more clearly set forth what is believed to be Applicant's claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited sections in the Office Action of Lamming and Fogarty fail to disclose Applicant's invention as recited in amended claims 1, 25, and 26 that set forth a method, apparatus, and article of manufacture therefor, for controlling a document service request at a mobile computing device, in which a web browser operating at the mobile computing device transmits a web page with a list of document services that may be applied to the selected document *as well as a control module for communicating between the document server and the output device*. Further as claimed, the mobile device controls *using the control module* a connection between the document server and the output device to transmit there between a selected document in a format suitable for the output device, where the mobile device establishes the connection with the document server over a first of two communication channels and with the output device over a second of two

Application No. 09/682,488

communication channels.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 1, 25 and 26 are patentably distinguishable in view of Lamming and Fogarty. Insofar as claims 2-15 and 17-24 are concerned, these claims depend from presumably allowable independent claim 1 and are also believed to be in allowable condition.

In addition, the Office Action on pages 14-15 rejects claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Lamming and Fogarty and further in view of Wang et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,493,551. As claim 16 incorporate the limitations of independent claim 1 and believed to be in allowable for the reasons set forth above, there is no need to specifically address the merits of claim 16 which is believed to be patentable for the reasons set forth above with regards to claim 1.

2. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, reconsideration of this application and allowance thereof are earnestly solicited. In the event the Examiner considers a personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is hereby requested to call Attorney for Applicant(s), Thomas Zell.

Respectfully submitted,

*Thomas Zell*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas Zell  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 37,481  
Telephone: 650-812-4281  
Date: 8/17/05